

ATTACHMENT 3.1.2
SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 MEETING MINUTES
FORECASTING TECHNICAL TASK FORCE
SEPTEMBER 20, 2002

MEMO

DATE: September 20, 2002
TO: Forecasting Technical Task Force Members/Subregional Coordinators
FROM: Planning Data and Forecasting
SUBJECT: September 4, 2002 Meeting Minutes

**FTTF/SUBREGIONAL COORDINATORS
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 2002**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Bill Gayk, of CSUF/CDR. The group proceeded with self-introductions.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comments were put forth.

3.1 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1.1 August 14, 2002 Meeting Minutes

Action: The minutes of August 14, 2002 were approved unanimously by the joint committee with modifications.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEM

4.1 Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Gayk said that the working group assembled for the evaluation criteria participated in two conference calls. The memorandum included in the agenda summarizes the discussions.

Mr. Levy, of CCSCE, explained the background on the criteria and why they were being utilized to evaluate local input. Mr. Levy said that one of the objectives of the evaluation criteria is that the sum of the local input should add up to close to the regional totals for population, households and employment. SCAG is not interested in having each city agree exactly with the projections that have been sent to them. The criteria are intended to reflect broad trends and broad relationships. If the local input is

off by a certain percentage but add up to be within the range and does not violate transportation capacity analysis and environmental criteria then it is acceptable. The broad relationships are: 1) Growth at the regional level slows each decade. This is due to slowing of national job and population growth after 2010; 2) All of the counties in the region show slightly lower household size and households grow faster than population each decade during the period; and 3) Jobs grow faster than population through 2010 and then slower than population after 2010.

At the county level all counties exhibit decreasing growth each decade. There is still extensive commuting and there is no job housing balance in all counties. Questions to be asked are, 1) What happens if all of the local input is summed and it is found to be inconsistent with the criteria?; 2) How are the adjustments to be made? Two members of the working group (Mr. Gayk and Mr. A. J. Wilson, of Pomona Valley Educational Foundation) suggested that the counties should be involved to resolve this lack of balance.

Mr. Ty Schuiling, of SANBAG, had minor concerns. Mr. Schuiling said there should be consistency in the terminology. The memorandum should consistently state growth rates instead of growth. Mr. Schuiling believed that the sentence in the bottom paragraph of page 18 should be taken out, and that SCAG does not want to presuppose what the local input is going to be. Also, Mr. Schuiling said “intraregional” should replace “interregional” criteria on the last page. Mr. Schuiling also had a more fundamental question about the purpose of the document.

Ms. Liu explained the two main purposes of the document. First is for inclusion in the local review package as “Proposed Evaluation Criteria”. Second is to provide a framework for the evaluation of local input in order to form the baseline projection.

The first regional criterion is, “Job, population and household growth rates decrease each decade.” Mr. Paul Silvern, of HR & A, Inc., called attention to the handout with the trend projections and growth rates. Mr. Silvern said that it would be helpful to look at the numbers when reviewing the text.

The second regional criterion is, “Job growth rates are higher than population growth rates through 2010 and slower than population growth rates after 2010.” Mr. Levy stated that the primary reason for this trend is the retirement of the baby boom population.

Mr. Ron Taira, of OCTA, asked about the relevance of the ratios between employment and housing. Mr. Taira said that the job/household ratio in Riverside County declines between 2000 and 2030. From a transportation perspective there is an increased demand between counties. Mr. Taira said that there is a need to look at workers.

Mr. Levy said that the trend projection assumes that there will be continued commuting between counties. Households are projected to grow faster than jobs. As a result the Inland Empire will still be a commuting area although less so than now. Mr. Taira said

that there was a need to see the baseline projection and to run the transportation model with the data.

Mr. Levy said that there is already serious trouble that is exacerbated in future years. There should be some response to the constraints. The intuitive trend should be the same or better. The ratio goes down region wide and every county goes down except Imperial after 2010. The commuting relationships need to be tested.

The third regional criterion is, "Household growth rates are higher than job growth rates and higher than population growth rates." This statement is for the 2000-2030 time period. It was pointed out that the history changes after 2010. Ms. Liu asked whether the FTTF wanted the criteria for the entire 30-year period in order to give more flexibility over the period.

Mr. Silvern stated that it is important to break down the criteria by decade to show the change that will occur after 2010. Mr. Silvern said that local governments are limited to the near term and will focus on 2010, 2015 and 2020. They have no informed opinion about long-term growth rates.

Mr. Dowell Myers, of USC, stated that there needs to be consistency between the text and tables. Mr. Myers suggested that a new column be inserted that showed growth between 2000 and 2030.

Mr. Gayk reminded the FTTF about the footnote that was included under this criteria. The footnote states the household projections show the potential for household growth that is consistent with regional job projections and associated population growth and with reasonable trends in household forming behavior of the region's residents. Mr. Gayk stated that the housing building capacity could fall short of the pressure and demand from households. Mr. Gayk said that land availability is a major issue. The amount of land available is lower than the demand from households.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr said that when the transportation capacity analysis is overlaid with environmental constraints, it will indicate a significant number of acres of land that cannot be used. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr asked how the environmental constraints will be utilized.

Ms. Liu stated that environmental constraints will be considered in the local review packages. Environmental constraints will also be addressed after local input is received.

The fourth regional criterion is, "The SCAG share of U.S. job growth should be within a reasonable range (between 10.216 million jobs and 10.599 million jobs)." It was also stated that population and households should move accordingly.

Mr. Levy stated that the top of the range is higher than in the past. The bottom end of the range would indicate that the region is declining compared to the United States as a whole.

Mr. Schuiling stated that the last sentence implies that population and households are dependent variables. If jobs are high and population is low, it is an argument to reduce jobs. Mr. Levy stated that if all cities say that they do not want housing, they will not get the job growth. Mr. Gayk said that it is possible to adjust either or both. The share of job growth will be constrained by a lack of housing. Mr. Silvern recommended that the last sentence of the fourth criteria be removed. A footnote will be added clarifying this relationship.

The next topic of discussion was the county evaluation criteria. The first county criteria is, "Job, population and household growth decreases each decade in all counties." Mr. Levy stated that this is true for all counties in the Trend Projection. This criteria will be stated as growth rates.

The second county criteria is, "Household growth rates are higher than population growth rates each decade in all counties."

The third county criteria is, "Each county has an increasing share of regional jobs except for Los Angeles County." Mr. Goetz Wolff, of CRES, suggested using the "jobs" instead of employment. Mr. Levy stated that the projections imply the retirement of the baby boom generation. One of the challenges is expected to be the education of the labor force over the upcoming years. A concern was also raised over the lack of housing being a deterrent to job creation.

Mr. Kevin Viera, of WRCOG, stated that there was a need to match the socioeconomic variables to the definition list that will be included in the local review package. Mr. Viera requested that these terms be added to the definition list.

Ms. Shimoto-Lohr stated that if future jobs are projected based on square footage factors, etc., the estimate of jobs would be much higher than would actually be filled. Mr. Levy stated that local governments have zoned more commercial and industrial land than is reasonable to develop. It will be necessary to turn back the numbers both proportionately and based on the supporting evidence that is presented.

Mr. Schuiling stated that employment growth is based on growth rates and absorption rates. Mr. Levy said that jurisdictions should not be able to steal jobs by being overaggressive in their projections.

Ms. Tracy Sato, of the City of Anaheim, stated that with criteria she is more comfortable if we agree that some of the rules can be broken if there is justification for the differences.

Mr. Silvern stated that the details on the reconciliation process still need to be worked out. One of Mr. Silvern's concerns is how environmental constraints will be incorporated into the process. Ms. Liu stated that there was a need for a conference call to discuss these issues. Mr. Silvern said when examining intra-regional relationships, examining

environmental carrying capacity is a way to get to the right answer. Mr. Silvern stated that transportation modeling is not the only thing to look at. It was pointed out that many general plans do not reflect recent environmental constraints.

Action: The first, second, third and fourth (with the change noted above), regional criteria were approved by the joint committee. The joint committee also approved all three county evaluation criteria.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

Ms. Liu discussed the various steps within the local review process. Ms. Liu said there would be a follow-up meeting sometime in late September. On October 3, 2002, the Regional Council and Policy Committee will hold meetings in Long Beach. The League of Cities conference will be held there. Ms. Liu said that the evaluation criteria will be discussed at the CEHD meeting as related to the growth forecast. This will be provided as an information item. Ms. Liu said that feedback received from the policy makers will be presented to the FTTF/Subregional Coordinators sometime in October. Necessary revisions will be made at that time. Any revisions made to the evaluation criteria will be presented to the CEHD as an action item for its November meeting, and information item for the Regional Council. Ms. Liu said that the evaluation criteria will then be presented to the Regional Council for approval in early December. Ms. Liu said the local review process will start September 15, 2002. Information will be sent out by September 10, 2002. The deadline for feedback is November 15, 2002. The baseline projections will then be formed for finalization based on the evaluation criteria.

In response to an inquiry as to whether the local jurisdictions will receive a final approved document of the criteria, Ms. Liu said that if the group is comfortable, the evaluation criteria can be provided upon CEHD approval sometime in November. This information will not be available during the local review time period. Ms. Liu said that the joint committee will be invited to multiple meetings to discuss the process. Ms. Liu said the aggregated numbers will be looked at at the regional level after local input. The numbers will be compared to the regional criteria first to check consistency. If they are not, evaluation of county level will be necessary. Ms. Liu said that county level representatives, including subregional representatives, and experts in this arena will be brought together to reconcile the county level difference. Upon resolution, the issue will be brought to the joint committee with local jurisdiction representatives. In this process, Ms. Liu said that a smaller group assembled first before going to the joint committee for review would be best. Ms. Liu said the meeting would be open to the public.

6.0 NEXT STEPS

Ms. Lisa Hardy, of the City of Santa Clarita, suggested the crafting of one main document that would organize all of the instructional information usually presented in memorandum form to municipalities. Ms. Hardy suggested that perhaps a handbook could be assembled. Ms. Hardy said she believed this would greatly aid planners. Ms. Liu said that SCAG staff would look into development of such a handbook.

Mr. Ty Schuiling, of SANBAG, and Ms. Laurie Lile, of North L.A. County, suggested minor edits to the local review cover letter, which Ms. Liu noted.

Mr. Gayk said the evaluation criteria will be finalized and approved at the next meeting. The process for handling the input from the local review will also be discussed.

The next FTTF/Subregional Coordinators meeting was not scheduled at this meeting.

**ATTENDANCE OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2002
FTTF/SUBREGIONAL COORDINATORS MEETING**

Name	Agency
Viviane Doche-Boulos	D.B. Consulting
Bill Gayk	CSUF/CDR
Steve Gonzales	City of Monterey Park
Jeff Hamilton	City of Glendale
Lisa Hardy	City of Santa Clarita
Stephen Higa	City of Laguna Niguel
Jack Humphrey	GCCOG
Steve Levy	CCSCE
Marika Modugno	City of Santa Clarita
Dowell Meyers	USC
Laurie Lile	North LA County
Siri Payakapan	County of Orange
Ginger Ryba	SANBAG
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	OCCOG
Shelly Sabate	CARB
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Ty Schuiling	SANBAG
Paul Silvern	HR&A, Inc.
Jesse Starke	Godbe Research
Ron Taira	OCTA
Jack Tsao	LA City
Cathy Wahlstrom	City of Ontario
Carla Walecka	Carla Walecka Planning
Kevin Viera	WRCOG
A.J. Wilson	Pomona Valley Educ. Foundation
Goetz Wolff	CRES

SCAG Staff

Huasha Liu
JiHong McDermott
Steve Weiner
Susan Wilderson

Public Comment Attendees

Videoconferencers

Paul Fagan
Shirley Medina

Caltrans, District 8
Riverside County

Teleconferencers

Rosa Lopez

Imperial County
